



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

HD

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/087,627	03/01/2002	Vincent Formale	RSW920020013 US1	3717

46270 7590 06/21/2007
IBM CORPORATION (SYL-RSW)
C/O SYNNESTVEDT & LECHNER LLP
1101 MARKET STREET, SUITE 2600
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19107

EXAMINER

THEIN, MARIA TERESA T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3627

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

06/21/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/087,627

Applicant(s)

FORMALE ET AL.

Examiner

Marissa Thein

Art Unit

3627

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 April 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Response to Arguments

Applicants' "Response to Office Action of January 10, 2007" filed on April 3, 2007 has been considered.

Claims 1-18 remain pending in this application and an action on the merits follows.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the book "Intermediate Accounting", (pages 499-521) (tenth edition) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,047,267 to Owens et al. and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 2002/0082966 to O'Brien

Regarding claims 1 and 9, Intermediate Accounting discloses classifying an asset as capital or an expensed asset (page 518) comprising: selecting a minimum capitalization value (page 518); receiving purchase data signifying the acquisition of an asset (page 501; page 502); determining a machine type of the acquired asset (page 50; page 502); comparing the value assigned to said machine type of the acquired asset to said minimum capitalization value (page 509; page 514); and if the value for the

Art Unit: 3627

machine type of the acquired asset is greater than or equal to said minimum capitalization value, classifying the asset as a capital asset, and if the value of r the machine type of the acquired asset is less than the minimum capitalization value, classifying the asset as an expensed asset (page 518).

However, Intermediate Accounting does not explicitly disclose assigning with respect to each of a plurality of machine types an average value of a model of said machine type independent of a value of the acquired asset; and computer readable product embodied on computer readable media readable by a computing device.

Intermediate Accounting does disclose valuation of an asset (page 509). To properly reflect cost, assets purchased on long-term contracts are accounted for at the present value of the consideration exchanged between the contracting parties at the date of the transaction ("Deferred Payment Contract" page 509).

O'Brien, on the other hand, teaches assigning with respect to each of a plurality of machine types an average value of a model of said machine type independent of a value of the acquired asset. O'Brien teaches a benchmark value which is a numerical or financial value. The Numerical values can be aggregated, averaged, or otherwise manipulated or processed. (Paragraph 162) The benchmark information system is related to a particular asset against similar information for an entire group of similar assets. The system provides users with the ability to define the group of assets included in a particular analysis. (Paragraph 15) O'Brien further teaches benchmarking pool assets which can be selected on the basis of a shared characteristics, a shared

Art Unit: 3627

data value for a particular characteristic (paragraph 159). Asset selection for benchmarking purposes should have some relevant characteristic or data value (paragraph 159). The benchmark characteristics include the type of asset (the type or model) paragraph 16).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the Intermediate Accounting, to include assigning with respect to each of a plurality of machine types an average value of a model of said machine type independent of a value of the acquired asset, as taught by O'Brien, in order to automatically gather and analyze information relating to the maintenance of a plurality of assets, so as to maximize pertinent and industry wide data to facilitate increasingly informed purchasing decisions in the future (O'Brien paragraph 2).

Owens, on the other hand, teaches a computer readable product embodied on computer readable media readable by a computing device (col. 3, lines 14-18).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the Intermediate Accounting, to include a computer readable product embodied on computer readable media readable by a computing device, as taught by Owens, in order to automatically gather and store information.

Regarding claims 2-8 and 10-18, the combination of Intermediate Accounting and Owens substantially discloses the claimed invention, however, the combination does

Art Unit: 3627

not disclose the models of the machine type; determining a value of the models; calculating the average value of the models; instructions for weighing the value of each model; weighting the value of each model as a function of predicted purchasing trends of models; the value of the models are derived form the manufacturer's suggested retail price of said model; the value of the models are derived form the manufacturer's base manufacturing cost; determining the values of a predetermined date; the date of commercial release; a data stem containing the purchaser orders; and reading the machine type out of a data field in the purchase order.

O'Brien, on the other hand, teaches the models of the machine type (paragraph 37; paragraphs 160-162; paragraphs 166-167); determining a value of the models (paragraph 37; paragraphs 160-162; paragraphs 166-167); calculating the average value of the models (paragraph 37; paragraphs 160-162; paragraphs 166-167); instructions for weighing the value of each model (paragraph 16; paragraph 137; paragraphs 75-77; paragraphs 158-162; paragraphs 163-167); weighting the value of each model as a function of predicted purchasing trends of models (paragraph 16; paragraph 137; paragraphs 75-77; paragraphs 158-162; paragraphs 163-167); the value of the models are derived form the manufacturer's suggested retail price of said model (paragraph 16; paragraph 137; paragraphs 75-77; paragraphs 158-162; paragraphs 163-167); the value of the models are derived form the manufacturer's base manufacturing cost (paragraph 16; paragraph 137; paragraphs 75-77; paragraphs 158-162; paragraphs 163-167); determining the values of a predetermined date (paragraph 16; paragraph 137; paragraphs 75-77; paragraphs 158-162; paragraphs 163-167); the

Art Unit: 3627

date of commercial release (paragraph 16; paragraph 137; paragraphs 75-77; paragraphs 158-162; paragraphs 163-167); a data stem containing the purchaser orders (paragraph 37; paragraph 156; paragraph 158); and reading the machine type out of a data field in the purchase order (paragraph 37; paragraph 156; paragraph 158).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the combination, to include the model and data stream containing the purchase order, in order to capture and retain information relating to cost and utilization of an asset in order to facilitate better procurement and other business decisions (O'Brien, paragraph 5).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed April 3, 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant remarks that "the prior art of record does not suggest (a) assigning with respect to each of a plurality of machine types an average value of a model of said machine type independent of a value of the acquired asset or (b) if said average value for said machine type of said acquired asset is greater than or equal to said minimum capitalization value, classifying the asset as a capital asset, and if said average value for said machine type of said acquired asset is less than the minimum capitalization value, classifying the asset as an expensed asset".

Examiner notes that the combination of "Intermediate Accounting", Owen and O'Brien discloses the above recitation. Intermediate Accounting does disclose "if the value for the machine type of the acquired asset is greater than or equal to said

Art Unit: 3627

minimum capitalization value, classifying the asset as a capital asset, and if the value for the machine type of the acquired asset is less than the minimum capitalization value, classifying the asset as an expensed asset". In page 518, Intermediate accounting discloses costs that is incurred to achieve greater further benefits should be capitalized, whereas expenditures that simple maintain a given level of service should be expensed. Furthermore, Intermediate Accounting discloses that most expenditures below and established arbitrary minimum amount are expensed rather than capitalized. Such expenditures below and established arbitrary minimum amount are expensed rather than capitalized is considered "if the value for the machine type of the acquired asset is greater than or equal to said minimum capitalization value, classifying the asset as a capital asset, and if the value for the machine type of the acquired asset is less than the minimum capitalization value, classifying the asset as an expensed asset".

Intermediate Accounting does not explicitly discloses the assigning with respect to each of a plurality of machine types an average value of a model of said machine type independent of a value of the acquired asset. Intermediate Accounting does disclose fair market value of what is given up or the fair value of the asset received (Valuation, top of page 509).

However, the Examiner then turns to O'Brien to teach the assigning with respect to each of a plurality of machine types an average value of a model of said machine type independent of a value of the acquired asset. O'Brien teaches a benchmark heuristic to generate a benchmark value from the pool of potential benchmarking information. The benchmark value represents some relationship to the data values of a

Art Unit: 3627

particular characteristic or set of characteristics. If a target asset (value of acquired asset) is being compared to the pool of potential benchmark information, data values for one or more asset characteristics of the target asset can be compared to the benchmark values for one or more asset characteristics in the pool of potential benchmarking information. (Paragraph 161) Furthermore, O'Brien teaches a benchmark value which is a numerical. The Numerical values can be aggregated, averaged, or otherwise manipulated or processed. (Paragraph 162) The benchmark information system is related to a particular asset against similar information for an entire group of similar assets. The system provides users with the ability to define the group of assets included in a particular analysis. (Paragraph 15) O'Brien further teaches benchmarking pool assets which can be selected on the basis of a shared characteristics, a shared data value for a particular characteristic (paragraph 159). Asset selection for benchmarking purposes should have some relevant characteristic or data value (paragraph 159). The benchmark characteristics include the type of asset (the type or model) paragraph 16).

Such benchmark value represents some relationship to the data values of a particular characteristic or set of characteristics; benchmark value being numerical which can be averaged; and if a target asset (value of acquired asset) is being compared to the pool of potential benchmark information, data values for one or more asset characteristics of the target asset can be compared to the benchmark values for one or more asset characteristics in the pool of potential benchmarking information; are

Art Unit: 3627

considered "assigning with respect to each of a plurality of machine types an average value of a model of said machine type independent of a value of the acquired asset".

Owen was cited for teaching a computer readable product embodied on computer readable media readable by a computing device.

Applicants remark that "the Office is making a piecemeal combination of two references with a basis in prior art for doing so and is clearly using improper hindsight reconstruction to arrive at the present invention".

Examiner directs Applicants' attention to the above discussion.

In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

In response to applicant's argument that the examiner's conclusion of obviousness is based upon improper hindsight reasoning, it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See *In re McLaughlin*, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971).

Art Unit: 3627

Applicants remark pertaining to claim 9 which is similar to the language of claim 1.

Examiner directs Applicants' attention to the discussion above.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Marissa Thein whose telephone number is 571-272-6764. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ryan Zeender can be reached on 571-272-6790. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3627

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Mtot
June 11, 2007

EQ 2A
Elaine Gort
Primary Examiner
AU 3627